

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA  
Richmond Division**

**SEALED PLAINTIFF 1,**

**and**

**SEALED PLAINTIFF 2,**

**Plaintiffs,**

**v.**

**Civil Action No. 3:22cv670**

**PATRIOT FRONT, *et al.*,**

**Defendants.**

**ORDER**

This matter comes before the Court on *pro se* Defendant Thomas Dail’s Motion for Extension of Time (the “Motion”). (ECF No. 62.) In the Motion, Dail asks the Court for “an extension [of time] up to [March 1, 2023,] to respond to the [A]mended [C]omplaint.” (ECF No. 62, at 1.) Dail contends that he has “had difficulty finding an attorney to represent him,” but that he believes “he has found one” and that the “attorney will appear on [his] behalf next week.” (ECF No. 62, at 1.)

Upon due consideration, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1),<sup>1</sup> and for good cause shown, the Court GRANTS the Motion. (ECF No. 62.) Dail SHALL respond to the Amended Complaint no later than March 1, 2023.

---

<sup>1</sup> Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(b)(1) provides:

(1) *In General.* When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may, for good cause, extend the time:

(A) with or without motion or notice if the court acts, or if a request is made, before the original time or its extension expires; or[.]

Let the Clerk send a copy of this Order to all counsel of record and to Dail at his address of record.

It is SO ORDERED.

Date: 02/21/23  
Richmond, Virginia

/s/  
M. Hannah Lauck  
United States District Judge

---

(B) on motion made after the time has expired if the party failed to act because of excusable neglect.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1).